THEOLOGY

VOL. LVI SEPTEMBER, 1953 No. 399

Editorial

WE have delayed in calling attention to the second volume of Professor Emil Brunner's Dogmatics—*The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*[1]—as we had hoped that a further volume would soon be making its appearance. In Vol. I it was stated that the whole work would consist of three or four volumes and that they had already been planned. But we are now given to understand that there is no present prospect that a further volume will soon be ready. While we hope Dr Brunner will be able to carry out his original plan, it seems likely that his chief contributions to theology will be deemed to have been his earlier works—*The Mediator, The Divine Imperative,* etc.—and that the Dogmatics will add little to his achievement. He is here traversing ground that for the most part he has traversed more diligently and more fully before, and from the literary point of view there is something rather slapdash about the volume before us. It reads like the swift talk of a fluent and fascinating conversationalist. Readers who are familiar with Dr Brunner's earlier works will not find much that is new to them, except for his comments on matters of recent controversy like "de-mythologizing" (pp. 186–192, 263–270) and typological exegesis (pp. 209–213).

On the other hand, the Dogmatics will obviously serve in future as the most convenient introduction to the teaching of one of the most powerful theologians of our time. It will also be a very useful supplementary textbook for those who are making a systematic study of Christian doctrine. And any theologian who feels his mind growing stale or static will find that Brunner's writing still has many more stimulative than sedative qualities. Conciseness, however, is not one of them. If there is a long delay in the appearance of the final volumes, it is to be hoped that one reason may be that the author is using a chisel upon them—an instrument which he has not much employed in the past.

The principal subjects dealt with in *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption* are Creation, Sin, Angels and Evil Spirits, Providence, History, The Law, The Work and the Person of Christ. Brunner insists that the right theological method in studying the doctrine of creation as well as other doctrines is to go first to the New Testament and to proceed from there to the Old Testament. That is to say, the primary source of the Christian doctrine of creation is the prologue to the Fourth Gospel and not the opening chapters of Genesis. The application of this principle is one of the distinct characteristics of the present volume. Another is Brunner's steadfast

[1] Lutterworth Press, 25s. On the first volume, see THEOLOGY, March 1950, pp. 81 f.

adherence to his well-known axiom concerning "truth as encounter" (*Wahrheit ist Begegnung*). But it would be misleading to suggest that rigid consistency is a mark of this work. Brunner does not mind contradicting or correcting himself, and on the whole he is more successful at pointing out many different aspects of the truth than in arriving at clear or satisfying conclusions. This circumstance may account for his comparative popularity with Anglicans. Among the particular topics concerning which this volume deserves to be consulted are: the idea of creation *ex nihilo, analogia entis,* the distinction between the creation and the preservation of the world, the notion of a premundane fall, and the existence of the devil. There is less that deserves the particular attention of readers of THEOLOGY in the section on Redemption, perhaps because, as Brunner acknowledges, British theologians have done much more original work on this subject than they have on Creation.

It remains to be said that Dr Olive Wyon, except that she constantly misplaces the word "only", has produced another admirable translation.

The Trinity in Whom We Live[1]

IN the old world people who divulged the mysteries went about in fear of thunderbolts, and, says the poet, I wouldn't put out in a boat with such a man, not wishing to drown. The Christian faith has no such secrets from mankind; its mysteries are open to inspection, and yet a man feels something of a villain to profane the Trinity and throw it broadcast on the air. For to talk about the Trinity is to talk about the heart of faith. So long as we keep to the outworks of religion, the Trinity does not come into view at all; in that border region we talk about God simply as God. But to-night I have to talk about the Trinity of Divine Persons, and you who hear me must not expect frontier manœuvres between faith and unbelief. If you believe already, you will be led back into a reflection on the deepest and most sacred thing; if you do not believe, you must endure an undisguised confession of belief opened from the centre and not from the circumference.

And what is the centre? It is the Love of God. The name of Love has been fearfully profaned, and yet no other name will do. If, for example, we were content to contemplate the *benevolence* of God, we should not open up the region in which the Trinity is revealed, but only if we go beyond benevolence into love. Benevolence may be no more than a general and diffused well-wishing; love requires that a person should be infinitely prized. A headmaster might be sincerely benevolent and not love a single one of his pupils, and that, perhaps, would be an ideal state of affairs. A father who was benevolent to his family and loved none of his children would not have done so well. The welfare state is a moral possibility if its officials are predominantly benevolent, but we do not expect them to love us.

---

[1] A broadcast talk.

In mentioning the welfare state we have hit upon a point of some religious importance, for the influence of political organization on religious feeling has been at all times profound. When we had absolute monarchy we had a theology of divine sovereignty; now we have welfare politics our religion is divine benevolence. It is instinctive to us to think of God's power as taking over where human power leaves off, as caring for the intimate distresses which no public officer relieves, controlling dangers no police can master, and, where the state hospital is defeated at last, raising the dead. But God's kingdom is not paternal government. Paternal government is only a bastard sort of fatherliness, and God is a true father so far as loving his children goes.

And that is easily said. It is easy to tell ourselves a tale about God's love for us, another thing to receive his love and reciprocate it, as (if you will let me quote a piece of very ancient religion) it was Moses' privilege to do, when God is said to have spoken with him as a man speaks with his friend, face to face and without disguises. A man's face lights up the face of his friend, and Moses' face shone, reflecting that countenance which is the Light of the world. Moses was remembered by Israel not as a man who spoke of divine love edifyingly, but as a man to whom divine love spoke effectively, so that he answered that love, reflecting it back upon God in prayer and outwards in devotion to mankind.

You may wonder why I talk about Moses, who has been stylized into a myth by remote tradition, and not about Christian saints, whose histories are more exactly recorded. I would indeed talk about the saints if I were citing evidence, but at present I am doing no such thing. I am just giving you a picture to fix your minds on, and the pictorial qualities of the ancient figure are striking enough. And for the same reason I will, while I am about it, remind you of another antique personage. If God is said to have spoken with Moses as a man speaks to his friend, he is said to have honoured Abraham with the actual title: "Abraham, my friend", says the divine voice; his friend because he was admitted to his confidence. "Shall I hide from Abraham", said the Lord God, "the thing that I do, seeing that I know him?" So Abraham was lifted into the counsels of God; and we read in the touching simplicity of the ancient story how, in the guise of a traveller unknown, God came upon Abraham sitting by his tent door in the cool of the day. Abraham, showing all hospitable kindness, entertained not only angels, but his Creator unawares, and had such discourses at his table as are to form the everlasting bliss of heaven.

What Genesis sets forth in the vividness of the picture is to be enjoyed by every Christian in the reality of spirit. God makes every one of us his friend, he sets us at his table, he shares his thought with us, he shows us his kindness, he puts an infinite price upon our love. Many truths of religion will bear endless meditation, but this above all; we can recall it as often as we pray, that God holds our love for him incomparably more dear than we hold the love of those who are dearest to us. Nothing moves our penitence more than to recognize that we have withheld what God desires and ourselves despised what

he prizes most; nothing calls out our adoration more than a love which, knowing us to the bottom, continues to care for us under all our self-obsession and frivolity. It would be a great thing if we could love any single person as we love ourselves, but we cannot love even ourselves as our Creator loves us.

Friendship involves some kind of an equality, or, if not an equality, then an equalization. To make a friend of a child I must both be a child to him and also treat him as a grown person. God both descends to us, dealing humanly with his human creatures, and also lifts us to himself. By conversing with us he makes us able to sustain our part of the converse. There would be no light to shine back from Moses' face into the eyes of God, had Moses not received the shining of those heavenly eyes upon his own; no intercessions for Sodom in the mouth of Abraham, but that God provoked him into speech by first showing him the counsels of his judgment; no confidence to pray in any Christian heart, were it not warmed by the promises of mercy in Christ Jesus. To pray is to give God back the mind of God, coloured with our own. But we must first be given the mind of God, thoughts and concerns from a level above mortality.

God equalizes us with himself in the sense that he makes us party to a friendship with himself, but the equalization equalizes sheer inequalities. A man may make a friend of a child, some even say of a dog or of a horse, and such an affection may be stronger than friendship; but friendship it is not, in the strict sense of the word, but at the most a special extension of friendship, and friendship would never have received a name if this were all the friendship that there was. By making a friend of a child I extend to him what belongs properly to my equal, and by making friends of us our Father and our God extends to us by a stretch incomparably wider what belongs uniquely to his co-equal Son. If God's love for us were all the love there was, then divine love would never have been. It is only because divine love has a natural object that it overflows to embrace an adopted object. We are the children of God by adoption, the eternal Son of God is Son by nature.

Human friendship, belonging to our equals, can be extended to children, but there is a special case of such extension to which the name "extension" most properly applies. I mean when my friendship for children is part of, an extension of, my friendship for their parent, when my friendship for him or her embraces them. There is an even more special case when the friendship we are thinking of is between my wife and me (for surely married affection is friendship, though it is also more). Then the children are specially hers, and yet I have (as the common saying goes) given them to her. And so she comes before me as one who says, "I and the children you have given me", not wishing to be loved apart from the children. The Epistle to the Hebrews puts almost those very words into the mouth of Christ. Our redeemer is as one who says: "I and the children whom God has given me." For the heavenly Father has given Christians to Christ, though not, of course, in the way in which a husband gives children to his wife; we are not speaking of a sexual relationship, however

spiritualized. Nevertheless, Christ, like the woman we were thinking of, comes before the Father with us his children, as though unwilling to be loved by him, unless his love is extended to us. But what fear is there that it will not be so extended, considering that the Father has given us to his Son?

The love whereby our divine Father loves us is an actual part of the one love with which he loves his eternal Son, for God is one and his love is one piece. He could not be one unless his love were one, for he *is* love, says St John, and only if there is one love can there be one God. So all the gifts of the Father's love to Christ are in a manner extended to Christians. "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased" is an oracle of love that speaks to sinners because they are among the number of whom Christ says: "I and the children whom God has given me."

"To know Christ is to know the benefits we derive from him", says one of the fathers of the Protestant Reformation. What benefit do we chiefly derive from him? The heavenly sonship which overflows from him to us. And how do we know him from that benefit? We see that what we have in part and by adoption he has by nature and in fullness, the pure and simple sonship is his. We do not best understand the Divine Father and the Divine Son by drawing allegories from human sons and human fathers, but by a method more real and more direct—that is, from experiencing divine sonship extended to ourselves.

But, having grasped the similarity, we must go on to seize the difference: the Son of God differs infinitely from us, his sonship from ours. It is usual to say that, whereas God *made* us, he begot his Son, but that is little better than a textbook formula. It draws a distinction, it does nothing to explain it. For we were not made, as we understand making, nor was he begotten, as we understand begetting. He was not begotten, for he was begotten of no womb, and we were not made, for we were made of no material. Both the only begotten Son and we, the many spirits created, depend and derive wholly from the Father of all. The Eternal Son is utterly derived, utterly dependent, but he is the full expression of his Father's nature and being and, therefore, not less in nature or glory than the Father who begets him. The Son also is Eternal God, for otherwise the Father's act of begetting would be imperfect, he would not beget what is best or worthiest of himself. The Son has nothing that he does not derive from the Father, but he derives from the Father all the Father has to give. Were he not equal with the Father, he would lack the capacity to receive all that the Father has the bounty to bestow. His love, like ours, is a response and a reciprocation; and no spirit lower than God can reciprocate all the love of God. He depends on the Father not for less than we do, but for infinitely more. Like us, he depends on the Father for all things. We receive from the Father all we are, he alone receives from the Father all the Father is.

We were thinking just now of Moses and the shining of his face by reflection of divine radiance. But what a narrow glass is the upturned face of Moses to reflect the glory of the Light that warms the

world! Only the face of God reflects the face of God, there alone is converse in true equality, and eyes that answer eyes with a perfect intelligence. St Paul, interpreting for us the shining of Moses' face, says that the God who inflows as light on Moses is the Holy Ghost. The apostle's interpretation is true to our experience; if we answer divine love it is by divine inspiration. But how little is there in us for the divine Spirit to inspire! The Holy Ghost is measured in us by the narrowness of our vessel, to the Eternal Son he gives himself without measure. The Son does not measure the Spirit by limiting him, he perfectly expresses him by perfectly receiving him. Holy Ghost means the divine life communicated or bestowed. Holy Ghost has no being except in another: the first and proper being of the Holy Ghost is in the Eternal Son.

What! Does the Eternal Son himself need to be inspired? If he is to answer his Father's love, cannot he answer of himself? The objection is a transposition into highest heaven of the famous English opinion that dependence on God is a weakness, it would be better to be self-reliant. But Christianity leaves no place for the arguments of pride, least of all in the perfection of the Godhead. The Son delights to receive everything from his Father, and to draw all that is good from the only source of good. To answer the Father's love without the Father's inspiration would not (even if it were possible) be a heightening of bliss, but quite the reverse, for to be filled with God is exactly what we desire, or should desire, so what would be the blessedness of cutting off the channel? And heaven differs from earth chiefly in this, that the blessed are more completely dependent on God's inspiration than we are.

So there are two acts of God the Father, neither conceivable without the other—to beget and to bestow: to beget the Son, to bestow on him the Holy Ghost. Both acts are perfect: what is begotten is God, and what is bestowed is equally God. The divine Persons do not lack perfection by needing one another, for what they require they eternally possess. The Father does not lack for the expression of his Fatherhood, he expresses it perpetually in his Son. The Son lacks nothing of the Father's inspiration, since he has the Holy Ghost. The Spirit is not imperfectly real through being the completion of another's life; he enjoys perfection in being perfectly bestowed on a perfect recipient by a perfect giver. Here are not three Gods; here is one Godhead which can be what it essentially is, a society of Love, only through distribution in three Persons.

I am aware that I have spoken most haltingly of a great mystery, but in one respect I am sure I have spoken right, and that is in the course I have taken. I have expounded the Trinity as both the meaning and the setting of that love which the Father has actually bestowed upon us. I will have nothing to do with the Trinity as a cool speculation about the necessary nature of the Godhead, and I think it would be idiocy to place such confidence in theological reasonings as to evolve the Trinity by rational argument. The Trinity is revealed to Christians because they are taken into the Trinity, because the threefold love of God wraps them round, because it is

in the Trinity they have their Christian being. Every time I worship or pray or make the least motion of the heart towards God I stand with the divine Son in face of the divine Father, the mantle of his sonship spread around me, and the love of the Father overflowing from him to me in the grace of the Holy Ghost.

Please understand that a Christian who talks like this does not talk comfortably. His being in the Trinity is his Christian existence: it is the unspeakable gift of God's mercy to him. But all the gifts of God judge us as fast as they save us. It is the depth of my condemnation that I so meanly use the infinite generosity of God. And yet God's gifts save us as fast as they judge us, or they would not be gifts: his mercy prevails.

To speak of divine love is not complacency towards ourselves, but neither is it callousness towards mankind. I say this because I find that, in many people's eyes, to exalt the love of God is a crime against human sympathy. Only a hardened heart (they think) can praise the government of a universe which allows intolerable evils. But even if I admit the charge of callousness against myself, I cannot admit it against my fellow-believers. The Christian heart is not a hardened heart. We are just *men*, we feel what you feel. Are your dearest and most natural wishes often utterly frustrated? So are ours. Do your friends die of cancer in their early fifties? So do ours. If atom bombs crack over our heads the year after next, will it be your tragedy? It will be ours too. Is the web of life in which you are enmeshed a tissue of moral disappointment and ignoble compromise? Our situation is largely the same. We neither deny nor palliate any of these evils, for we do not (as I said before) uphold a theology of divine benevolence or pretend that the kingdom of God is an omnipotent welfare state. Nor do we claim that God has made us able to explain or justify the evil of our condition: we claim that he has taken measures to save us from the wreck. Himself bearing our pains, and crucified for our salvation, he has lifted us into the love of the Blessed Trinity. The severity of the diseases we endure is a poor argument to refuse the remedy, and if malice bedevils the world, what reason is it to fling back the pleadings of immortal love?

AUSTIN FARRER.

Christ's Conquest of Satan, in its Relation to the Individual

THE interpretation of the work of Christ which represents the Cross and Resurrection as a divine victory over the hostile powers of evil is one which has made a strong appeal to our generation. Against this interpretation it is, however, sometimes argued that the whole conception is too mythological, not a theological account at all, and lacking in direct relevance to the life of the individual.

If it be true that there is an element of myth in this idea of the Atonement, it must also be said that it is an element which has penetrated deeply into the New Testament writings. If so central a theme as this contains an element of mythology, it should be one of

the first to undergo the demythologizing which both Professor Bultmann and his critics agree is one of the legitimate concerns of theology to-day, even though Bultmann's own approach to the task be rejected.

It is the purpose of this article to suggest that between the demonology of the New Testament and the kind of terms in which we think to-day there is an adequate bridge—namely, St Paul's exposition of the Gospel in his epistle to the Romans. It may also be demonstrated that, with St Paul as interpreter, the whole conception of Christ's victory over Satan becomes a matter of urgent relevancy for the individual.

According to the New Testament, the fundamental cleavage in the universe is not metaphysical, as between spiritual and material, but moral. The most serious conflict is between the holiness and love of God, and all that is opposed to it, and in rebellion against it. This opposition, this cleavage, is to be seen in the spiritual and the material realms alike. There are suggestions in the Synoptic Gospels that material or physical evil, such as disease, has its origin in the spirit-realm, in the activities of the devil, whose agents are described significantly and characteristically by St Mark as "*unclean* spirits", where the *unclean* means essentially the *unholy*, that which is opposed to God's holiness. St Paul expresses the same fundamental contrast in 2 Cor. 6. 14–7. 1. This whole passage is shot through with these essential differences: on the one side Beliar, uncleanness, defilement; and on the other Christ, cleansing, holiness. Moreover, it is here made explicit that defilement may be of both "flesh and spirit". Cleansing must also therefore be of both flesh and spirit.

This moral dualism of the New Testament has its roots in the Jewish apocalyptic writings, which represent an attempt to see the problem of evil steadily and to see it whole. Ultimate questions are being asked about both physical and spiritual evil, and the answer being given is that both are aspects of rebellion against God, of which the spearhead is human sin. In its totality this opposition throughout the universe to the holy will of God constitutes cosmic evil, the work, these writings affirm, of a personal prince of evil, a fallen angel, who is nevertheless a created being and finally subject to God. Neither in Jewish apocalyptic nor in the New Testament is there any absolute and eternal dualism. Evil is due to the rebellion of God's creatures against him, the rebellion of wills created free by God. Man's sinfulness, and all the ills to which he is subject, consist in his being involved in this opposition to the holy will of God; and this human involvement is the most serious aspect of the whole situation.

Thus the salvation which man needs is nothing less than deliverance from this opposition to God's will which runs everywhere throughout the universe. In the New Testament, as in the Old, salvation is frequently described as *deliverance* (Luke 1. 74; 11. 4; Rom. 7. 24; 11. 26; Col. 1. 13; 1 Thess. 1. 10), and in the New Testament, as in the Old, the end which salvation has in view is the restoration of man, and the cosmos, to harmony and fellowship with God—i.e., the ending of the opposition.

In the events of Christ's life, death, and resurrection we see this opposition to God being brought to a head and overcome. In the words of Paul Tillich, we see, in the mystery of the Atonement, Divine Love paying the price of a universal re-union with itself of that which stands opposed to Love.[1] We see the love of God, in Christ, overcoming the demonic (2 Cor. 5. 19; Col. 2. 15; Heb. 2. 14, 15; 1 John 3. 8). But what does this mean so far as the individual is concerned? How am I implicated in Christ's conquest of the demonic forces, if at all? Or am I merely a delighted spectator? The manner in which the Christus Victor theme is sometimes preached suggests the latter. While it is true that the message of Christ's victory is, in the end, good news, it can be this only when it has first been heard, as it were, as bad news to me personally. The salvation of the world by God, in Christ, has a wider reference than the salvation of isolated individuals, according to the New Testament—e.g., 1 Cor. 15. 24–28. But this salvation, if it is true salvation, must be experienced at the personal level by the individual.

The events of Christ's life, death, and resurrection are the story of the final, decisive intensifying of the demonic opposition to God and its decisive conquest. This theme is written large in St Mark's Gospel. It is stated clearly in the closing words of what, according to Dr R. H. Lightfoot, is the Prologue (i.e., 1. 1–13; the conflict theme of the Gospel is stated in verses 12, 13). The same theme is found at the beginning of Christ's ministry; the unclean spirit, "speaking in the plural on behalf of the whole race of demons" (Dr Rawlinson's commentary, p. 16), cries: "Thou art come to destroy us!" Henceforward the demonic opposition to God, who is active in Christ ("the Holy One of God"), intensifies until it reaches its final climax, the attempt to destroy him who comes to destroy the demons. St Luke emphasizes that the responsibility for the delivering up of Jesus is ultimately Satan's (Luke 22. 3, 4). This theme becomes even more explicit in the Fourth Gospel. The mounting opposition of the Jews, which the activities of Jesus call forth, is, according to St John, fundamentally Satanic (John 8. 42–44; 12. 31; 16. 11). Once again, behind the action of Judas is the activity of Satan (John 13. 2, 27). This activity of Satan, expressed through the actions of the opponents of Jesus, is the characteristic Satanic activity of murder (John 8. 44).

Thus the activity of the human will in its opposition to the holiness and love of God is essentially diabolical. This human diabolical opposition, which is sin, when confronted by God active in the life of Jesus, issues in the attempted destruction of Jesus. As far as the human will, represented by the Jews, is concerned, his destruction was certainly intended and attempted. But the awfulness of the Gospel story consists in the fact that behind those human actions, done to some extent in ignorance of who Jesus was (Acts

[1] Firth Memorial Lectures, delivered at Nottingham, 1952 (not yet published).

13. 27; 1 Cor. 2. 6, 8), there may be seen the activity of Satan, who knew, from the beginning of the encounter, whom he was attempting to destroy and what was the ultimate issue involved. In other words, demonic activity, manifested in the actions of men, has for its stark ultimate intention the murder of God. It is characteristic of Satan to carry his opposition to God to this final madness of intention. Stauffer brings out this point in his *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*: "The devil is God's adversary, and consequently the enemy of God's creation. His very name betrays that. He is envious of God (Wisd. 2. 24). All his thoughts and desires are set upon theomachy. He opposes himself to everything God does. . . . In Satan there is a survival of the primordial power of Chaos and its hostility to Creation (Gen. 15. 11; John 8. 44). The Adversary is the spirit of constant negation—in the most serious cosmic and historical fashion. Hence he answers every act of God with a counter-activity (Gen. 3. 15; Matt. 13. 19, 25). But the more the Adversary gets excited, the more it becomes plain that, as he seeks his own glory by his opposition, he is exhausting himself in a negation that in the end can only reveal the profound vanity and unreality of his nature, and the sole glory of God" (op. cit., Sec. 13).

It is also characteristic of Satan, however, that he deceives men about his real intentions and about the real issues involved. It is this which gives him his power. Otherwise men would not serve him. It is characteristic of him to "blind the minds of the unbelieving" (2 Cor. 4. 4). This consideration makes it unlikely that *τῶν ἀρχόντων του αἰῶνος τούτου* in 1 Cor. 2. 6, 8 means the demonic powers, but means rather, as in Acts 13. 27, the "rulers" of Jerusalem, who did to Jesus what they did *ἀγνοήσαντες*. Otherwise, as St Paul observes, "they would not have crucified the Lord of glory" (1 Cor. 2. 8).

It was necessary that the rulers of Jerusalem, unaware of what they were really doing, should be allowed to do to Jesus "whatsoever they listed" (Matt. 17. 12). The same is true of Pilate, who, similarly, as the agent of the devil's homicidal energy, is allowed "from above" his authority to do what he does (John 19.11; see Hoskyns and Davey, ad loc.). The human will, in its fundamental state of opposition to God, deceived by Satan about the real nature of its activities, culminates in the intention, and in the attempt, to destroy God. The Jews were "children of Abraham", yet because they sought to kill Jesus they revealed that they were also children and bondservants of the devil (John 8. 34–44). They were the victims of the devil's deceptions, and, thus deceived, they became, without knowing it, the agents of his destructive activity. The only way in which Satan might be unmasked, and thereby stripped of his power, the only way in which his ultimately mad designs might be revealed to men, was for the Son of God to lay himself open to Satan's final assault. "The Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again" (Mark 8. 31). In this consists his Messiahship. The statement is made three times, in order to emphasize its stern necessity (Mark 8. 31; 9. 31; 10. 33). The divine drama must necessarily be played out

to its end. Meanwhile the human agents of his death, if they are to play their part in the divinely ordained plan must, until all is done, remain in their ignorance of who Jesus is, must remain in the blindness with which Satan blinds all men. It is for this reason that the demons, who know who Jesus is, are, from the beginning, charged to hold their peace (Mark 1. 25, 34; 3. 11, 12), and when Peter at Caesarea Philippi declares that Jesus is "the Christ, the Son of the living God", it is made clear that such insight at this point was impossible to "flesh and blood"; it is a revelation from the Father (Matt. 16. 17). The disciples are therefore charged to keep the fact a secret (Matt. 16. 20; cf. Luke 9. 36) until the divine drama had run its course, "until the Son of Man be risen from the dead" (Matt. 17. 9).

The events of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus reveal to us the disastrous, doomed condition of human nature as it exists in Adam. For what greater condemnation of man could there be than that as he exists in Adam, led astray by Satanic guile, he will seek ultimately, yet unwittingly, to destroy his Creator. That is what the Gospel reveals to us about our condition; that is the ultimate truth about our bondage to Satan and his deceptions. It is at this point that the demonology of the New Testament bears demythologizing. We need to understand that the activities of the demons and Satan, about which the New Testament speaks, are our activities, although our actions may seldom appear to us in this light. We need also to realize that the sentence of doom which the Gospel pronounces upon Satan and his hosts is a sentence of doom upon ourselves.

It is here that St Paul's exposition of the Gospel in his epistle to the Romans serves as a bridge. In the sixth chapter he affirms that in the death of Christ we also died: "Our old man was crucified with him" (6. 6). In the death of Christ our life in Adam, our natural life, was condemned and died. The life of the human will in rebellion against God can receive no greater or more final condemnation than we have seen that it received in the death of Christ, the attempt of the human will to destroy God incarnate. We have to understand that our life in Adam, our life of alienation from God, a life in which we are deceived and dominated by Satan, stands condemned. The message of doom upon Satan is a message of doom upon us. The message of Christus Victor must be accepted first as a message of humiliation of ourselves, our "old" selves. To hear that message means to understand that henceforth, if we continue to live in rebellion against God, we are living on in a condition that has been condemned and is doomed to destruction, like a "condemned" building. This condemned building in which we live is the prison-house of Sin; but there is this additional fact, that while Christ's death condemned the building, his Resurrection burst open its doors, so that we are now at liberty to leave the prison-house, if we will.

This bursting open of the doors is entirely God's gracious act. "Forgiveness" is expressed by St Paul in the verb *charizomai*, because it is something offered to us by God absolutely gratuitously, dependent on nothing that we have done. It is the offer made to us, by God's graciousness alone, in the Resurrection of Jesus, ". . . so

that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life"—i.e., through the glory of the Father (Rom. 6. 4). This newness of life is given to us by God upon the death of our old selves, our old rebellious selves. It is not that we have to destroy or condemn those old selves; Christ has already done that in his death. They are under sentence of death already. But we are, none the less, faced with a choice. We have to choose whether to continue walking in the old life, which is doomed, or to walk in the new life, into which we, like Christ, may be raised, through the glory of the Father; that is, through the gracious, spontaneous love of God: "The wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 6. 23).

Thus Christ's conquest of Satan in the Cross and Resurrection intimately and vitally concerns me, since it confronts me with a vital choice. Whereas Adam and his wife were deceived by the subtlety of the serpent into making a false choice ("The serpent beguiled me" [Gen. 3. 13]), now the seed of Adam has bruised the serpent's head. Christ has, in his death, uncovered Satan's negative, life-destroying purposes; he has exposed and made clear the end towards which Satan's insane activities are directed; he has shown Satan to be deceiver and destroyer, and Satan's deception is at an end wherever the Cross is proclaimed. God has made a show of the principalities and powers; in the Cross they have become humiliated captives in Christ's triumphal procession (Col. 2. 15). The Cross reveals what Satan had hitherto successfully concealed, the profound quality of life-negation and God-negation that informs all Satan's activities, and thus the actions of the natural man, wherever Satan's guile remains covered. This exposure and humiliation of Satan at the Cross is an earnest of his final frustration and exposure in the last day. Meanwhile the disciples are to rejoice, not so much at the downfall of Satan, as for the possibility of new life which this brings to them (Luke 10. 18–20).

In the Cross we, unlike Adam, are offered a real choice, in which the issues are clearly displayed. The message of the Cross is indeed a message of Christ's conquest of the demonic; it is thereby a message to me about my own life and the decision which faces me. It is a message to which I am forced, one way or the other, to make a personal response.

TREVOR LING.

Jehovah's Witnesses

"JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES" is the final name chosen by a sect which has been known variously as "The Millennial Dawn", "The International Bible Students' Association", "The Watchtower Organization", and the company of those who subscribe to the doctrine "Millions now living will never die!" The present designation of this body was applied to it by "Judge" Rutherford in 1931 and is based upon the words of Isaiah: "Ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah."[1]

[1] Isa. 43. 10.

This prolific sect has come into the public eye by reason of its pertinacious tract-sellers and because its adherents refuse to undergo conscription or military service.

I

It originated in the mind of Charles Taze Russell at Alleghany, Pittsburgh, in 1872. Its author, then aged twenty, was a member of the local Congregational Church and of the Y.M.C.A. in the neighbourhood. The real forerunners of the movement, however, were a group of Second Adventists, and, in particular, a J. H. Paton, to whose writings Russell was greatly indebted, though it was beneath him to acknowledge this.

Russell was a wealthy haberdasher who had inherited five shops from his father, but which he sold in order to devote his entire working days to the dissemination of his views. As a speaker he was compelling, and as an organizer efficient. In 1884 he founded a new religious organization named the Zion's Watchtower Society. Apart from a magazine which he edited and largely wrote and a mass of tracts which he composed, he produced a seven-volume series entitled *Studies in the Scriptures,* which is the main compendium of the doctrines of the Witnesses. The movement spread to England in 1880, and in a further eight years its representatives were active in China, India, Turkey, Haiti, and Africa.

Russell is a curiously disreputable figure to have originated a new religious movement. So overweening was his egotism that he claimed to be a competent Greek scholar, though, as was proved in court, he did not know a letter of the alphabet of that language. His domineering conceit and wayward affections became widely known when his wife sued him for divorce and her petition was readily granted. He was accused by the *Brooklyn Eagle* of selling grain, which he advertised as "miracle-wheat" at sixty dollars a bushel, and he admitted that there was "some element of truth" in the charge. He was also believed to have played upon the fears of sick persons to induce them to make over their fortunes to his organization. This was all the more hypocritical of him, as he jibed at the monies collected by the Christian Churches and advertised Witness gatherings as "No Collection Meetings". His egotism was boundless, for he stated in the introductory pages of his *Studies in the Scriptures* that it would be better to leave the Bible unopened and to read his commentary on it than to omit the latter and read only the Bible.

Russell died in October 1916. So impressed was the attorney of the Witnesses, the misnamed "Judge" Rutherford, that he wrote:

> When the history of the Church of Christ is fully written, it will be found that the place next to St Paul in the gallery of fame as expounders of the Gospel of the great Master will be occupied by Charles Taze Russell.[1]

It is hardly surprising that so ardent a devotee of the founder of the movement should have been elected to succeed him. From 1917 until

[1] Cited by H. H. Stroup, *The Jehovah's Witnesses* (Columbia University Press, 1945), pp. 12–13.

his death in 1942, Rutherford led the Witnesses with an iron but successful hand. He, too, was a prolific writer, and he implemented the propaganda of the organization by a radio network and the sale of gramophone records of his addresses.

Despite its popularity, however, the movement was banned in several countries because its adherents refused the duties of citizenship and proselytized amongst the members of the Christian Churches. They were proscribed in Northern Rhodesia after a disturbance in the Copper Belt in the nineteen thirties. In 1940 and 1941 the New Zealand and Australian Governments outlawed them as a subversive organization. In January 1947 the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that they "were not a religious body", and in the same year they were banned in Southern Rhodesia.

II

One of the main reasons for their success in terms of statistics is their autocratic and hierarchic type of organization. This is marked by all the efficiency characteristic of a modern international business house. At the head is a central, all-powerful Board of Directors. Under this Board and responsible to it are the various "Religious Servants", and beneath them the many "Zone Servants". The latter have responsibility for the local groups, which are known as "Companies". They meet in the "Kingdom Hall". At the head of each Company is the "Service Director", who is responsible to the Zone Servant for running the Company. He is assisted by a "service committee", which takes charge of various activities, particularly of the "back calls"—that is, repeated visiting of contacts. Women are discouraged from seeking office, and each member of the hierarchy obeys the orders of his superior without question.

The chief task of the Witnesses is the distribution of the official publications from door to door. Each member is expected to assume his share of these duties, and many are equipped with a portable gramophone on which recordings of Rutherford's sermons are played to the householders. All details of visits have to be reported on specially printed forms to the Board of Directors at headquarters. In brief, the Witnesses are organized as a group of religious commercial travellers.

III

A survey of their teaching will reveal that the Jehovah's Witnesses are heretics, in addition to being schismatics. In their doctrine of God they are monotheistic, if not definitely unitarian. Perhaps their teaching about the person of Christ is most akin to the Arian heresy of the fourth century A.D., for they assert that the Son of God is a created being. This is the purport of the following citation from Russell:

> As he [Jesus] was the highest of all Jehovah's creation, so also was he the first, the direct creation of God, the "only Begotten", and then he, as Jehovah's power, and in his name, created all things. . . .[1]

[1] *Studies in the Scriptures*, V, p. 84.

Russell repudiates the Chalcedonian Definition's claim that in Jesus Christ the divine and human natures co-existed:

> Neither was Jesus a combination of the two natures, human and spiritual. The blending of two natures produces neither the one nor the other, but an imperfect, hybrid thing, which is obnoxious to the divine arrangement.[1]

The Witnesses are committed to the curious belief that before his incarnation Jesus was the Archangel Michael, which they believe is taught in Dan. 12. 1. They also hold that Jesus gave up his angelic nature in the days of his flesh and was an ordinary fallible mortal. They claim that, although Jesus was not divine, he paid at his death the ransom necessary to set men free from death, but that his work of Atonement "will be completed with the close of the Millennial Age".[2] They further reduce the stature of the eternal Son of God by declaring that elect Christians, "the little flock", will "be reckoned as joint sacrificers, joint mediators, joint reconcilers" with Jesus.[3] Salvation largely consists in being imitators of Jesus, which argues, of course, self-salvation.

The Witnesses do not believe that the redeeming work of Christ was completed on the Cross or that those who have faith in him are saved from their sins and inherit eternal life. Russell taught:

> The "ransom for all" given by "the man Christ Jesus" does not give or guarantee everlasting life or blessing to any man; but it does guarantee to every man another opportunity or trial for life everlasting.[4]

Thus, far from being saved by Christ, each man must work out his own salvation:

> Some have been blinded in part, and some completely by the God of this world, and they must be recovered from blindness as well as from death, that they, *each for himself*, may have a full chance to prove, by obedience or disobedience, their worthiness or unworthiness of life eternal.[5]

This is clearly justification by works, not justification by faith.

The Witnesses also believe that Jesus was provided with a new spiritual body at the resurrection, and that his human body was neither raised nor glorified. In one place Russell teaches:

> He was put to death *a man*, but was raised from the dead a *spirit being* of the highest order of the divine nature. . . .[6]

In another he declares:

> Our Lord's human body was, however, supernaturally removed from the tomb, because had it remained there it would have been an insurmountable obstacle to the faith of the disciples, who were not yet instructed in spiritual things. . . .[7]

Significantly (for the Witnesses are essentially a commercial organization), the permanent status of the Ascended Christ is described as being "the Chief Executive Officer of Jehovah".[8]

---

[1] Op. cit., I, p. 179.
[2] J. K. van Baalen, *The Chaos of Cults*, p. 147.
[3] Ibid.
[4] *Studies in the Scriptures*, I, p. 150.
[5] Ibid., p. 158.
[6] Op. cit., V, p. 453.
[7] Op. cit., II, p. 129.
[8] Rutherford, *Riches*, p. 94.

It is not surprising that the Witnesses find the doctrine of the Trinity irrational, since they have reduced the status of the eternal Son of God to that of a fallible mortal and conceive of the Holy Spirit as merely the invisible influence of Jehovah.[1]

They have a ghoulish fondness for the text "The wages of sin is death". They claim that all men are destroyed in death, but that all the dead will be raised again and given a second chance at the Second Advent of Christ. In making such assertions they ignore the promise made by our Lord to the penitent thief, "This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise", and the implications of the metaphor by which the New Testament describes the dead as those "that are fallen asleep in Christ". The doctrine of the second chance is an encouragement to libertarians, apart from its infidelity to the New Testament insistence on the way of salvation and the way of damnation as irrevocable destinies of men. This doctrine alone gives substance to the taunt that the teaching of the Jehovah's Witnesses is the religion of the natural man. Should evil men refuse the proffered salvation the second time, their fate will be annihilation, not eternal torment or damnation.

Despite the erroneous nature of much of this teaching, the Witnesses can be congratulated on refusing to picture God as a divine sadist whose dignity is established by the torturing of the damned. Rutherford taught:

> Eternal torture is void of the principle of love "God is love". A Creator that would torture his creatures eternally would be a fiend, and not a God of love.[2]

Furthermore, the Witnesses teach that even death may be spiritually remedial. The weakness is that they cannot conceive of divine love as *holy* love also: a world without rewards and punishments here and hereafter would be an immoral universe.

The unscriptural speculation of the Witnesses is given full scope in their account of the Second Advent and the Millennium. Russell declared that the Seventh Millennium was the beginning of the Reign of Christ, and he calculated that 1872 was the exact six thousandth year from the creation of Adam and Eve. He prophesied that the final end of the world would take place in 1914. Since that time his followers have postponed the date to some time before 1984, when Gabriel's trumpet will blow and Christ will announce that the final end has come. Then God's "Great Theocracy" will be established on earth and Jehovah's Witnesses will be the only survivors to share in this Divine Kingdom.

Their account of the Millennium is far more detailed than that offered by the Book of Revelation, and they have already decided how the problem of feeding the resurrected bodies may be solved:

> Remembering the Lord's promise that in the Millennial period "the earth shall yield her increase" and that the desert and the wilderness-places of the earth shall become as a Garden of Eden, we may safely estimate upon all the land, which we may find, according to recent estimates, to be

[1] Op. cit., p. 188.

[2] *World Distress*, p. 40.

> 57,000,000 square miles or over 36,000,000,000 acres. What would this mean as to space for each individual who has ever lived in the world, i.e. 28,441,126,838 persons? It means that there would be twelve hundred and seventy-five acres for each little village of two hundred families. Quite a sufficiency of room, all will agree, under the new conditions promised. But if more space be necessary, with faith we will readily see that it will be quite within the divine power to raise vast continents from the depths of the ocean, or indeed to give a literal as well as a symbolical fulfilment to the declaration—There shall be no more sea.[1]

The only fitting retort to such speculations is that of Dr Reinhold Niebuhr that faith has nothing to do with either the furniture of heaven or the temperature of hell!

After the battle of Armageddon the 144,000 faithful Jehovah's Witnesses will be taken up into heaven, there to rule with Christ over the new earth, which will be inhabited by the Jonadabs, or people of good will.

In our account of the beliefs of the Witnesses we cannot omit their loveless condemnation of the Christian Churches as devil-controlled. There could be no worse offence against Christian charity than this typical citation from their teaching:

> These facts are set forth here, not for the purpose of holding men up to ridicule, but for the purpose of informing the people that the ecclesiastical systems, Catholic and Protestant, are under supervision and control of the Devil, and form a part of his visible organization, and therefore constitute the anti-Christ.[2]

A sect claiming to be Christian, yet so vicious in its attitude to others who take the name of Christ on their lips, is guilty of an inner contradiction, for its spirit denies its profession.

In general, Jehovah's Witnesses fall under censure under four main characteristics. First, their doctrine is based upon an arbitrary selection of texts from the Scriptures, but the main body of the teaching of Jesus and his apostles is either evaded or perverted; and to each ounce of the Bible a hundredweight of speculation is added.

In the second place, their doctrine is largely based upon the obscurities of such apocalyptic books as Daniel and Revelation, implying that the Revelation of God is a tangled skein only to be unravelled by the subtle minds of this sect. But Christianity is not a mystery religion for initiates, for we "have seen the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ", who declared: "I am the Light of the World."

Thirdly, the use of the Bible as an *Old Moore's Almanac* of prediction is to misunderstand its purpose and to claim to know more than our Lord himself, who confessed that he did not know the time of the coming of the Son of Man again on the clouds.

Fourthly, their creed must be rejected because it offers salvation on too easy terms, affirming, in effect, that payment for it may be deferred to another existence. This is to repudiate the solemn and urgent Either-Or of the Bible and to sentimentalize the conception of a holy God. Moreover, as we have seen, this is a salvation by good works, not by faith in the victory of Christ.

[1] Rutherford, *Riches*, p. 188.

[2] Rutherford, *Deliverance*, p. 222.

IV

One further question remains to be answered: How have the devotees of such an unbalanced creed succeeded in winning so many members? This question is merely another way of asking: What can the Churches learn from the strategy of Jehovah's Witnesses?

Russell's success was partly due to his clarity of thought, simplicity of expression in untechnical language, and abundance of illustrations drawn from everyday life. Further, he and his followers have an unrivalled knowledge of Holy Writ and can quote chapter and verse for their opinions. It has been estimated that there are over 5,000 different scriptural citations in the books of Russell.[1] Jehovah's Witnesses have had the wisdom to assume and count upon every member being a propagandist of its organization, using the most up-to-date methods such as gramophones and radios and attractively printed, bound, and illustrated volumes.

Even their doctrines, in at least two cases, represent a healthy protest and reaction against current Christian orthodoxy. In their teaching about the "last things" they refuse to accept the "fire-and-brimstone" picture of hell and rightly protest against a doctrine that envisages punishment as vindictive, not remedial. The Jehovah's Witnesses, although denying the responsibilities of citizenship in so many ways, have protested against the devilries of modern warfare and the extravagance of modern life. It is also on record that their egalitarian convictions impelled them to welcome Socialism even in its early days, when few religious folk were Socialists. These, even when we condemn the Jehovah's Witnesses in so much, must be counted as its assets.

HORTON DAVIES.

Great Pastors—IX. Francis James Chavasse, 1846-1928

"THE only thing in the world", said Dr A. B. Davidson, "that has power to move others is reality, conviction, personal character; and all our efforts will bear little fruit unless this personal character be behind them." So much that once magnified the pastoral office is gone. But reverence remains, and will always remain, for that rare blend of transparent goodness and charity which is called "saintly". It is this touch of divineness in it that is everywhere the argument for the religion of Jesus Christ. Such pre-eminently was the character of Francis James Chavasse. And it was without over-statement that the *Liverpool Post* could write at his departure from Liverpool in 1923: "The influence of his character put a new mellowness into the religious life of the whole community." Who was the man, what was his record, to whom such a tribute could be paid?

The Bishop had that priceless heritage—a Christian home. His father, Thomas Chavasse, F.R.C.S., one of a noted medical family, practised at Wylde Green, near Birmingham. His mother, a remarkable woman of high character, had from his early years engrafted in

[1] Cf. Black, *New Forms of the Old Faith*, p. 200.

him the habit of daily Bible reading. And it was with the firm resolve to seek holy orders that he came up to Oxford in 1865. Oxford, for the seed thus planted, was fertile soil. On successive Sundays in 1866, as his diary records, he listened to such masters as Dr Pusey, Dean Goulburn, Canon Liddon, Archbishop Trench, and J. C. Ryle. He took a Sunday class. He was already apprehended by that faith that can "remove mountains" and which all his life was to empower him.

Chavasse was God's good gift to the Church in a period of anxious transition. By the close of the nineteenth century an array of religious difficulties, quite naturally aroused in Christian minds by the simultaneous "grand assault" of Darwinism, higher criticism, and modern psychology, called for a strong and scientific restatement of the Faith "once delivered to the saints". "Liberals", instead, sought to accommodate Christianity to the incoming tide, and in a mood of light-hearted optimism substituted for revealed religion a "modernism" denuded alike of miracle and of warning. It was all so well-intentioned; it was all, as the last half-century has proved, so deplorably destructive. For it has bred a complacent spirit of false security about the hereafter and a gradual impression that religion, as such, is largely irrelevant.

To this "diluted Christianity" Chavasse offered in his own person an uncompromising refutation. His whole temper was alien to controversy. "Always", he used to say, "meet error by teaching the truth." He preached the truth ceaselessly himself. Much more, he lived it. To the lay world he restored respect for the pastoral office. To a generation of clergy, disposed to assimilate themselves to contemporary standards, he showed that asceticism, when suffused with charity, can be infectiously attractive. His supreme gift to the Church of his day was to present in himself a pattern of what a shepherd of souls can be, and to manifest its fascination and its power.

Such was the man who, after parochial charges in Preston, Holloway, and in Oxford itself, came in 1889, at the age of forty-three, as Principal to Wycliffe Hall. Founded through the energy and the munificence of a group of clergy and laity, Wycliffe Hall was opened as a theological college in 1877. Chavasse was its second Principal. And quickly he gave to the whole college life a tone and quality of its own. The event of the week was the Principal's address in chapel on Fridays at 5.45, when he poured into us his very soul. It was his voice, his holiness, his profound reverence, his atmosphere of intense urgency that influenced the life of the place and that gave to each man in turn a new conception of an effective ministry. "God's bidding is God's enabling", he would say to us. "We are men of power as we are men of prayer." "Praying will keep you from sinning, or sinning will keep you from praying." "Visiting is the best of all Church defences." "Visit at all times, in all weathers, and in all states of health." "Don't be a smileless man in black."

Upon these foundations, so well and truly laid, was raised the crowning work of his life—ever to make his name memorable—his reign for twenty-three years as Bishop of Liverpool (1900–1923). He was our second Bishop. The See of Liverpool, carved out of the older

Diocese of Chester in 1880, had welcomed as its first father-in-God John Charles Ryle, six foot two in height, captain successively in his earlier years of the cricket elevens of both Eton and Oxford, a stalwart defender of the Faith. Chavasse, small in stature, was consecrated in York Minster on St Mark's Day, 25 April 1900, to rule with the same blend of gentleness and strength that had marked his days at Wycliffe Hall. His enthronement followed on 31 May. His first sermon, on Whit-Sunday, from the text "Not by might nor by power but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts", singularly struck the note of his subsequent episcopate. "When a man", he said, "enters upon any new work, if he thinks at all, his thoughts wander to that solemn account he must one day give. None will have to give so solemn an account as the bishops of Christ's Church. Where can man find strength to go forward and face the work to which God has called him? Only in two great facts of the Church's history—in the sacrifice of Calvary perfected by the Resurrection and Ascension, and in the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost."

Thus began that ceaseless ministry of preaching which was to touch the hearts of Lancashire people from end to end of the diocese. It was his singular art of preaching and speaking that took him direct to the consciences of his congregations and gave them a new tenderness for the Faith that he proclaimed. What was it? It was superb oratory. But it was more. It was infinite compassion getting home to the humblest, in such wise that the most illiterate could catch his meaning.

As it was with his preaching, so was it still more with that which, in the edifying of the Church of England ranks yet higher—his pastoral work. With his untiring industry and his ordering of every hour of the day the new Bishop had quickly penetrated into the furthest parts of the diocese and made contacts with all his clergy. Though a bishop appears to live in public, and though he seems to be for ever preaching and speaking, it is his building up of his clergy, his endless letters to them and for them, his interminable interviews with them, that decree his influence. It was here that Chavasse excelled. For his was the master touch evolved from assiduous devotion. Read his diary. At St Paul's, Preston, against 10 January 1873, he enters: "Hard day—visiting for 5 hours: worn out at night." 14 January: "Not free till 10.30 p.m. Then worn out and too tired to pray." 19 January: "Lord, teach me on my knees and from thy word, and grant that what I give out I may first have drawn from thee." How well he knew the infinite strain and burden of pastoral work! And how well we knew that he knew it. When he told us that a vicar ought to pay twenty-five visits a week and a curate at least forty, we were quite aware that such a figure was below what he had set himself.

Little wonder, then, that if the clergy quickly felt the stimulus of his influence, the laity felt it too. Here was a bishop after their own hearts, who represented to them exactly what they felt a father-in-God should be, who spoke to them in their own speech, who never seemed to be "off duty". He travelled third class. He went about in

trams. He made contacts all along. And across twenty or thirty years people have treasured his homely sayings and his gentle, courteous ways.

Yet more treasured were his profounder utterances. "Jesus first, others second, yourself last," was his address to a bride and bridegroom, indicating the secret of married happiness. "You must grow a skin like a rhinoceros"—this to a highly sensitive man—"I have to." "Get a red-hot centre in every church." Most typical of all, to a young vicar starting on new work: "Live near to God; let nothing interfere with your time of daily communion with him; keep your mornings for reading; prepare your weekly sermon with great care; be a friend to your people; visit them steadily and you are sure to be blessed." "There is no other life", he would say, "in which a man need do so little, or ought to do so much."

This series of personal sketches is one of "Great Pastors". Among such F. J. Chavasse must emerge pre-eminent. No tribute, however, to his memory can be adequate which fails to appreciate the magnitude of those two noble creations to which his shepherd-instinct gave visible expression: the Cathedral Church of Christ in Liverpool and St Peter's Hall at Oxford. Chavasse must rank among our most famous bishop-builders. What we owe to William of Wykeham, William of Waynflete, Henry Chichele for the peculiar glories of Winchester, and New College, Magdalen and All Souls, we owe equally to Chavasse for Liverpool Cathedral. True, as Sir Frederick Radcliffe says, "the people of Liverpool were its founders." It is to their outpouring of gifts and to the assiduous devotion of their leading citizens that the miracle of it is due. So vast an achievement at so vast a cost! One is always moved by it, and no less by the great concourses and by the beauty of the worship with which it has been crowned. One thing above all else accounts for it. As a monument to its initiator there has been raised, not a recumbent figure upon a cenotaph, but a simple bas-relief upon the reverse side of the throne, showing the Bishop with a model of the Cathedral at his side, in the attitude of prayer. By a sure instinct his friends divined the real secret of its creation.

Just as this "great pastor" must out of the fullness of his heart rear a stately fold for his flock, so must he likewise provide for its shepherding. For years past it had been his ambition that at the centre of the University that he loved there should be a college to perpetuate that Christian teaching to which he had devoted his life. Daring and unattainable as such a project might seem, the impossible has once more been achieved, and St Peter's Hall, Oxford, brought into being by the heroic persistence of his son Christopher, now Bishop of Rochester, and so ably administered by his successors, the Rev. J. P. Thornton-Duesbury and Canon R. W. Howard, is the result.

Francis James Chavasse presented in himself that type of clergyman for which every parish in turn seems to be clamouring—the assiduous pastor, the life-giving preacher, shepherd, prophet, saint,

in one. He has shown it to be both practical and popular. He made no claim to exceptional gifts. Indeed, he lamented that his gifts were not greater. He felt keenly his physical limitations. He was made "like unto his brethren", to the considerable consolation of many of them. He just lived out a life of complete devotion; and, far from alienating the common people thereby, he seemed only to bind them to himself more closely.

Let it be our prayer that across the years his example may stimulate others to a like service to their generation. If on all sides the cry is for more to assist us through life's pilgrimage in the way of comfort and culture and nurture, for more nurses and teachers, more agriculturists, more miners, more home workers, the direst of our needs is for more clergy of this best sort. For it is the future that supremely matters. Whilst others minister in countless ways to our present necessities, it is the office of the clergy, in response to the divine call, to attempt to assist men to their final destiny; to aid them, however inadequately, "so to pass through things temporal that they finally lose not the things eternal". And the triumph of Francis James Chavasse is to have lit with new radiance the glory of this endeavour.

H. Gresford Jones, Bp.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Francis James Chavasse. By J. B. Lancelot. Church Book Room Press.
F. J. Chavasse. By H. Gresford Jones. "Great Churchmen" Series. Church Book Room Press.
Parochial Sermons of Bishop Chavasse. Edited by H. D. S. Sweetapple. S.P.C.K.

American Letter: No. 17

CHRISTIANS IN A JEWISH THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE

American Jewry is a composite of three groups: *Orthodoxy* retains Hebrew as a sacred tongue, and observes the Law of Moses as its way of life, although those parts of it which deal with sacrifice and the priesthood are held to be unavoidably suspended at the present. Israel is considered to be in a state of probation, preserving and even fortifying the walls erected around her by the Law to keep her distinct from other nations while she awaits the coming of the Messiah. *Conservative Judaism* stands in a close relationship to Orthodoxy, insisting on the traditional observance of the Sabbath and of the dietary laws, but sometimes allowing the sexes to sit together in the synagogue and making some use of English in services. *Reform Judaism* looks back for its origin to the German Reform Movement, which arose in the early nineteenth century as an attempt to square Judaism with the positive insights of the new scientific understanding and to integrate the Jew into the structure of European society upon the dissolution of the ghetto. To the young generation, living under the new conditions, the value of much traditional ceremony and ritual was questionable. The religious leaders of emancipated Jewry therefore distinguished sharply between the moral and the ceremonial content of the law and concentrated on

preserving that ethical monotheism and prophetic idealism which was the essence of their faith, while other beliefs and practices were modified according to the demands of the time. The movement was transplanted to America, where modern Reform Judaism has retreated some way from the radicalism of the Pittsburgh program of 1885.

> We recognize in the Mosaic legislation a system of training the Jewish people for its mission during its national life in Palestine, and to-day we accept as binding only its moral laws, and maintain only such ceremonies as elevate and sanctify our lives, but reject all such as are not adapted to the views and habits of modern civilization.
>
> We hold that all such Mosaic and rabbinical laws as regulate diet, priestly purity, and dress, originated in ages and under the influence of ideas entirely foreign to our present mental and spiritual state. . . .
>
> We consider ourselves no longer a nation but a religious community and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish State.

There is to-day in Reform circles a desire to recapture as much of the colourful tradition of historic Judaism as is consonant with the conviction that form and ceremony are not ends in themselves: Purim, once scorned as a nationalistic Jewish festival, has been reintroduced and there is now a sympathetic attitude towards Zionism. However, the hope of a personal Messiah has been abandoned and replaced rather by a belief in the Messianic age: Jews are called upon so to live that their spiritual and moral convictions will be universally valued and emulated, and they must work for the inauguration of the age of universal knowledge of God, and of brotherhood, justice, and love among men.

To further the cause of Reform Judaism in America, the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, was founded in 1875 by Isaac M. Wise and the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York City by Stephen Wise in 1922. Both schools merged in 1950 under the presidency of Dr Nelson Glueck, the distinguished archæologist, and the two schools have between them been responsible for the ordination of more than 800 rabbis. Beginning in 1947 a number of Fellowships have been made available at Cincinnati for Christian ministers and graduate theological students. Seven such Fellowships were awarded this year in the amount of $1800.00 for single Fellows and $2400.00 for married ones. They are awarded for one year in the first place, but are renewable, and the holders may either take such courses as accord with their particular interests or work for the degree of Bachelor of Hebrew Letters or Doctor of Philosophy in Hebraic and Cognate Studies.

There are ninety-six students in the Rabbinic Department of the Cincinnati school, and, although they are usually Americans, the new admissions this year include three students from overseas who will return, after ordination, to serve Reform Judaism in their own countries. One, a survivor of the Nazi concentration camps, is from Czechoslovakia, another is from South Africa, and the third from Turkey. The normal period of training required of an ordinand is five years. The academic year is divided into two semesters of some

fifteen weeks each, and the first two years are spent reading for the B.H.L. degree. Candidates for admission are required to be graduates of a university and to come possessed of a reasonable proficiency in Hebrew: preparatory courses in this are provided by the school for such Jewish students of the University of Cincinnati as hope to become ordinands upon graduation. In any case, fourteen hours of each week in the students' first semester are taken up with an intensive course in Hebrew. Five hours of this are devoted to reading different kinds of Biblical texts—the narrative, the liturgical, and the legal—so that the vocabulary of the student is widened and he is able to read unvocalized Biblical texts with some degree of ease. A further six hours is spent going over the essential groundwork of Hebrew grammar, and in the remaining three hours a beginning is made on rabbinic Hebrew and the Mishnah. The student is kept on his toes in this course by a written examination on each week's work. In the remainder of the two years before the B.H.L. degree is taken he begins to read the gemara of the Babylonian Talmud and has to obtain credits in courses in it, and in Midrash and Homiletics, Aramaic, Medieval Commentaries, Jewish history up to 1500 C.E., and Liturgy. One of the things that most strikes a visitor with the background of an English theological college is the emphasis placed on the practical side of an ordinand's training, for not only has he to attend regular weekly classes in which speakers come in to talk on various aspects of a rabbi's work, but two hours each week are occupied with problems of public speaking and the preparation of various types of addresses. As well as gaining teaching experience in a Jewish school, the ordinand has to attend classes in which teaching methods and techniques are discussed and also to take a course in Human Relations, in which various consultants in the fields of psychiatry, anthropology, and sociology come in to speak on "the dynamics of human behaviour".

After securing this initial degree the student must, within the next three years, obtain credits in advanced courses on the subjects enumerated above as well as in Jewish philosophy and theology, and must submit an acceptable thesis. Exegetical courses which cover most of the books of the Old Testament are provided, and, while full use is made in these of the insights of modern criticism, there is a proper emphasis on knowledge of content other than of the minutiae of criticism. Naturally enough the student is also required to know how the Bible has been interpreted in historic Judaism as revealed in the rabbinic and subsequent literature. The practical side is again well to the front, and during the student's last two years he is often away from the college at week-ends and festivals to conduct services and to preach in Reform synagogues in other parts of the country. This happy combination of the theoretical and practical aspects of a man's training is designed to secure that the newly ordained rabbi can discharge his congregational responsibilities with a high degree of competence.

The Christian visitor has no grounds for complaint that his own religion is neglected. Christian origins are very fairly treated in the

history and theology course, and there are seminars in the literature of the New Testament in relation to the Judaism of its time, and in comparative liturgy, while the library is kept well stocked with current books on the New Testament by Christian writers. Since 1939 there has been a series of annual exchange lectures with various Christian theological seminaries, and in the fall of 1952 Dean Benton, of the Vanderbilt University School of Religion, lectured on "The Protestant Minister: His Calling, Preparation, and Activities". In return Dr. Glueck lectured at Vanderbilt early in 1953.

Clearly the Interfaith Fellowships so generously endowed by good friends of the College present a unique and valuable opportunity for Christians to study Judaism at first hand and to pursue studies in rabbinics and semitics. The present writer was the first English Fellow to be elected, and in conclusion may say that he has been met at every step by the legendary American kindness and hospitality.

J. R. Brown.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Farrer is Fellow and Chaplain of Trinity College, Oxford.

The Rev. Trevor Ling is a Baptist minister and a lecturer in the Department of Theology in the University of Nottingham.

The Rev. Horton Davies is Professor of Divinity, Grahamstown, South Africa. His article on "Jehovah's Witnesses" will form part of his book, *Christian Deviations*, which will deal with a number of similar movements. It will be published next year by the S.C.M. Press.

The Right Rev. H. Gresford Jones was Bishop of Warrington from 1927 to 1945.

CORRESPONDENCE

"THE FATHERS IN ENGLISH"

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Apropos of the Master of Selwyn's article in your August number, it is pleasant to note that C. Bigg recalled from his undergraduate days an Oxford professor who began his course of lectures on the Fathers of the Church as follows: "The works of the Christian Fathers, on which I am about to lecture, are available in two editions. The first, which you should all read, is contained in forty-eight volumes folio. Another but sadly abridged edition, which I cannot recommend, is in sixteen volumes quarto." See F. W. Hirst, *In the Golden Days*, p. 139.

Yours, etc.,
A. R. V.

[A further letter from the Rev. W. M. F. Scott about "The Sacrifice of Christ" will appear in October.]

GODFREY GOODMAN

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I hope I shall not appear ungrateful for Fr Brandreth's review of my book, *Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, 1583–1656*, if I ask to be allowed to correct one mis-statement of fact. I am accused of treating even Andrewes "with scant respect". The index shows that there are twenty-seven references to Andrewes in the text. Of these not one is critical, and many are laudatory. Only one reference (on page 1, not mentioned in the index) could fairly be called even critical, and it is concerned merely with the style of preaching of that great man.

Fr Brandreth finds Goodman "an embittered and essentially egotistical character". Other reviewers have found him "good, amiable, slightly silly", "a singularly sympathetic figure", "good-hearted, an amiable innocent", "a true man of God"!

If I have given to your reviewer the impression that I think "Goodman the only bishop of his time having a true faith or policy", I can only say that I hope he may be as singular in this as (up to the present) he is in his reading of Goodman's character.

Yours very truly,

GEOFFREY SODEN.

BARSHAM RECTORY,
BECCLES,
SUFFOLK.

BOOK REVIEWS

ANGLICAN PUBLIC WORSHIP. By Colin Dunlop. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

THE PARISH MEETING AT WORK. By Alan Ecclestone. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

The Dean of Lincoln gives us in short compass an admirable statement of the case for Public or Liturgical Worship and of the Anglican provision for it. Published in the Religious Book Club series, it is "avowedly intended for those who are not closely associated with Anglican worship"—and no better introduction could be offered. But there are few Anglicans who will not learn much from his pages and be grateful to have within two covers so much useful discussion of the varied questions surrounding public worship. The opening chapters on the Justification of Public Worship and on its Background are particularly valuable in relation to modern objections. He answers, carefully and cogently, common views on public worship which suggest that it is in some way or another a means to some further end—whether moral improvement or personal uplift or religious instruction, showing how the response of many perplexed clergy and ministers is to defend, or adapt, public worship by "accepting the" (incorrect) "premises of the objector". It can only be justified, he rightly affirms, by claiming boldly that "worship is the inevitable response to an objective situation . . . a man worships because he is a child of God, called to an eternal destiny in God's

Kingdom". Further, such worship must be public as well as private. For all men, because "true worship cannot co-exist with that failure in humility which shrinks from being one of a crowd"—a fair hit! For Christians most especially, by virtue of their membership in the Body of Christ, a subject worked out more fully in the second chapter.

Bishop Dunlop proceeds then to take in turn the Materials of Worship—Words, Music, Ceremonial—and to comment in turn on the questions raised by each: "extempore prayer" or "fixed liturgy"; the place of music as an element so (almost) necessary that without it worship is "truncated, needlessly limited and handicapped"; the necessity of some ceremonial, and the value of more than the strictly essential.

Next he turns to a brief account of the principles underlying the reformed Book(s) of Common Prayer and to a valuable discussion on Eucharist and Sacrifice preparatory to a detailed account of the Order for Holy Communion. His final chapter is on Morning and Evening Prayer, and provides a most useful *apologia* for those much-misused and much-misunderstood offices. He echoes the lament attributed to Archbishop Davidson that "while so much exposition and teaching was devoted to the Eucharist, so little attention was given to helping people understand Mattins and Evensong". In particular, he outlines the place and purpose of the Psalms, finding the clue to their interpretation as the voice of "Christ in his Church, or of the Church in Christ . . . not an individual's prayer, but the prayer of the whole Body, the very stuff of what we prosaically call 'corporate worship' ". We hope that the Dean's appeal for sustained and careful instruction on the Divine Office will bear fruit, and his book should help greatly to this end.

Alan Ecclestone's pamphlet should be of much practical value to all who want to know more about the purpose and actual working of the parish meeting, of which he and his parishioners in Sheffield have been pioneers. But many parishes are coming to realize the need (to put it no stronger) of "the assembling of the local Church, the Church in the parish, in order that it may realize and work out its essential life". It may take different forms, meet at different intervals, deal with different matters, and on all this Mr. Ecclestone's experience is at our disposal. It answers many pertinent questions and should help many inquirers.

HARROGATE. HENRY, KNARESBOROUGH.

DESIGN FOR LIFE. By A. M. Hunter. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

One may guess that Dr Hunter has written this book for S.C.M. study groups; and as such it could scarcely be bettered. It is lucidly and ably written, and besides stating the author's own opinions it expounds briefly some diverse interpretations of the Sermon on the Mount which will probably be new to most of its readers and provoke fruitful discussion. There is no other book available in English at the moment which does what Dr Hunter does here.

Dr Hunter believes that the Sermon on the Mount was compiled by the evangelist from words uttered on many different occasions and intended by him to be the Christian counterpart of the Jewish Torah. The precepts of the Sermon, however, are to be understood as principles which should guide the conduct of believers in the interim period between Christ's first coming and his second; and as examples of these principles in action Jesus gave a number of vivid illustrations which, couched in oriental hyperbole, would land us in absurdity if we practised them literally. Put together, these principles require nothing less than perfection, and though Jesus did not of set purpose enunciate principles which would be impossible to fulfil, it is nevertheless true that as a matter of experience his standard is unattainable, even with the power of the Holy Spirit. The Sermon therefore gives us the direction in which we must continuously strive rather than an ideal which converted Christians may hope to reach.

This sounds like good Reformed doctrine, and indeed Bultmann's well-known question is quoted with approval on page 115: "Will Windisch claim that he fulfils the demands of the Sermon? Or does he assume that some other man does? Then why not?" (though Dr Hunter might have mentioned in a note that the Liberal Windisch replied to Bultmann in the second edition of his *Der Sinn der Bergpredigt,* p. 149—and perhaps have added, in view of the current interest in Bultmann's theology, that this second edition is now available in an English translation by Dr S. M. Gilmour). But actually Dr Hunter criticizes "many Protestant scholars" who write as if Christ enunciated his standard of perfection "simply" to demonstrate that we fall short of the pure will of God. He quotes the editor of THEOLOGY as one such scholar and then allows himself to say that such a view "can be misleading" (p. 114)—which indeed it would be if the charge were true. It was naughty of him to let through the little word "simply".

I notice another inconsistency. Hunter admits all the Jewish and pagan parallels to the ethical teaching of our Lord, but at the same time insists that Jesus was addressing only his disciples, so that the Church has no right, for example, on the basis of the New Testament, to urge the State to write into its statutes a preference for matrimonial indissolubility. One would have thought that, if Jesus revealed more clearly what was already known less clearly by the natural man, then the Church's duty would be to proclaim its ethical teaching as universally valid and not merely a Christian peculiarity.

A short bibliography would have helped the kind of readers who will appreciate *Design for Life.* But enough of complaints. The fact is that if the clergy and people were to devote to this book one-tenth of the time and energy that we have lately expended on the rite of Coronation the Church of England would be renewed.

WILFRID BROWNING.

CUDDESDON COLLEGE, OXFORD.

A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity. By G. A. F. Knight. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers. Oliver and Boyd. 6s.

Professor Knight writes: "It is more than a possibility that our modern study of the Nature of God as revealed in the Hebrew Scriptures has opened up to us a much clearer understanding of God as a Trinity of Being than has been possible for those theologians who had only the LXX version of the Scriptures as the source from which to draw both their concepts and their actual language when they sought to erect a systematic Christian theology. . . . We are the fortunate generation who are excitedly examining the body of the Faith since its exhumation."

He is much too sweeping in his condemnation of the LXX and the primitive Church. Unwittingly he condemns the Church of the N.T. and comes near to limiting the true word of God to the Hebrew O.T. He rejects *ὁ ὤν* as the LXX translation of אֶהְיֶה without apparently noticing that it is legitimized for Christians by the Book of Revelation and by implication by the Fourth Gospel. If these are to be accused of "hellenizing" the Faith, some reasons should be given. He does not point out that the N.T. writers did not know or ignored the force of classical Hebrew. As used by the N.T. writers, the O.T. is a sacred book whose words carry weight much heavier than was realized by the original writers and hearers, and heavier than, considered simply as classical Hebrew, they can bear.

He ought not to build so much on the record of the revelation of the Divine Name in Exodus 3 without more thorough discussion of the critical and linguistic questions involved.

He rightly says that הָאָדָם in Genesis 1 and 2 "ought to be rendered by our expression 'humanity' ". But he goes on to allege that Jerome and the theologians of the Catholic Church, in their understanding of the doctrine of man, were led astray by the LXX translation of Genesis 2. 19, *πρὸς τὸν Ἀδάμ*. To disprove this it is sufficient to quote St Augustine's explanation of the name Adam: "There are four letters, A, D, A, and M, and with the Greeks the four quarters of the world have these initial letters. . . . Adam is thus scattered throughout the globe." And St Gregory of Nyssa: "This image of God finds its fulfilment in human nature as a whole."

Professor Knight's injustice to the LXX is illustrated by his treatment of Isaiah 63. 9. He writes: "This passage was translated into Greek probably in the second century B.C. under the influence of hellenistic culture, when there were Hebrews who had lost touch to a degree with the true metaphysical thought of their ancestors." It is surprising that he does not mention that in this passage the LXX is generally thought—e.g., by Kittel and Skinner—to give the correct reading.

It is right that important Hebrew words should be examined for their theological significance, but he squeezes them a bit too hard at times. His ideas about a developing God and that God gains something from our blessing him are somewhat difficult. Even if such ideas can be extracted from primitive Hebrew thought, they are not

necessarily valid, and if they are modified by the LXX may it not be an indication of the inspiration of that version? St Thomas is surely truer to the Bible as a whole when he writes: "Deus suam gloriam non quaerit propter se, sed propter nos." After all, "For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, saith the Lord."

In spite of these criticisms, Professor Knight has done something worth while, and the editors are to be congratulated on encouraging monographs of this kind. It is easy to see that a merely scientific and linguistic approach to the Hebrew O.T. is unsatisfactory and also that the precritical manner of exegesis is inadequate. Professor Knight has made an effort to work out a better way which should inspire others to the task too.

EYNSFORD. D. G. HILL.

THE REVELATIONS OF MECHTHILD OF MAGDEBURG. Translated by Lucy Menzies. Longmans. 18s.

Evelyn Underhill in her *Mysticism* first introduced to English readers the importance of Mechthild of Magdeburg, and she returned in other books to the study of this thirteenth-century mystic. Now Lucy Menzies has performed a labour of love in translating into English almost the whole of her book called *The Flowing Light of the Godhead.*

Miss Menzies quotes from a study of the poems by Preger: "She unites . . . delicate inner experience with childish naïve conceptions. . . ." This seems a very sound judgment. The childishness appears in her sometimes odd theological ideas (Miss Menzies observes that theology is not her strong point) and in some of her descriptions of her visions. Her account, for instance, of how the Trinity decided to create the Universe shows the loving and reverent imagination of a child, and her detailed vision of John the Baptist saying mass for her in heaven (worship with all the company of heaven was a great reality to Mechthild) got her into trouble with her contemporaries, who pointed out severely that John the Baptist was a layman.

But when one begins to wonder whether Dom Cuthbert Butler would not have called her experiences "an excess of sensible devotion", one begins also to perceive that her "sensible" devotion was founded on a very solid devotion of the will. In the latter half of the book especially there are passages which are far more reminiscent of the great Teresa than of Thérèse of Lisieux, whom at first sight she much resembles. The very last poem is in honour of Obedience, "the holy bond which binds the soul to God".

As she grew older, in consequence perhaps of responsibility or of persecution, her style became far more compact. There are touches of what she calls "sanctified sense" in her account of the duties of the Prioress:

> Thou shalt also go to the kitchen
> To make sure that the needful provision is good,

That neither thy meanness nor the cook's laziness
May rob the Lord of sweet music in Choir:
For no hungry priest may sing sweetly
Nor study deeply . . .

And her attitude to suffering appears in her teaching that "because earthly happiness has separated us from God, we must needs make our way back to him through suffering", and in her vision where Pain says: "Lord, I make many holy though I myself am not holy . . . and I bring many to Heaven, though I may never enter in myself."

Many examples could be chosen of this kind of compressed wisdom. Three must suffice:

"The more he gives her [the soul], the more she spends, the more she has."

"Those who would know much but love little
Ever remain at the beginning of a good life."

"That prayer . . . which a person makes with all his might . . . draws down the great God into the little heart, it drives the hungry soul up into the fullness of God. . . ."

Her faith was childlike but profound, her vision was real; and I doubt if in the end Dom Cuthbert Butler, who quotes appraisingly from Miss Underhill's work in his *Western Mysticism*, would disagree with her appreciation of Mechthild as an outstanding mystic of her day.

TRURO. GUY BOWDEN.

UNITY AND LANGUAGE: A Study in the Philosophy of Johann Georg Hamann. By James C. O'Flaherty. University of North Carolina. Cloth, $3. Paper, $2.50.

Dr O'Flaherty kindly refers to my review in this place (No. 376, October, 1951) of Dr Walter Lowrie's booklet on Hamann, the German eighteenth-century philosopher. In that review I said that Dr Lowrie had not "emphasized the pre-eminence for Hamann of a doctrine of language as revelation". Dr O'Flaherty's revision of his doctoral dissertation on "The Linguistic Foundations of Hamann's Concept of Unity" (presented at the University of Chicago in 1950) was expected on the strength of its title to be destined to make good what had seemed to be Dr Lowrie's deficiency in this respect. In recent years one notorious school of philosophers has insisted that only sentences in which words are used as a teacher of elementary physics might use them can be credited with meaning. A championship of the emotive and suggestive powers of language, a reminder of the unspoken that can underlie all expression, are plainly called for in order to enlarge the field of vision to which the victims of such teaching may be condemned. The latest little book by the German philosopher Dr Josef Pieper, *Philosophia negativa*, dealing with Aquinas, is the kind of thing I mean.

Is that what Hamann has to offer too? He was the principal stimulus for Herder, and Goethe both recognized and proclaimed

the seminal value of his thinking. But those testimonials are perfectly compatible with Hamann (who lived from 1733 to 1788) as but the precursor of German literary romanticism and as the teacher of no more than a variant of the doctrine of "art is revelation", and in that event there would be no call to exhume him from the obscurity in which he has been lying for 165 years. No doubt if we can take our uncertainty on that point to Rudolf Unger and his commentaries or subject it to the light of Erwin Metzke's book on Hamann's position in the philosophy of the eighteenth century, our minds will be clarified. But if we do not read German we shall unfortunately not obtain much help from Dr O'Flaherty. When the latter has told us that Hamann condemns abstraction, opposes the natural language which is, he says, the language of poetry with the abstract language which he exemplifies as being the language of mathematics, and claims for the former that it is the "womb" of reason and reason's progeny, that for Hamann language is experience and language and thought are inseparable, and that Hamann makes the transcendent unity of God provide "the basis" for belief in the unity of all reality, we feel as though we had been to a renowned restaurant and partaken of only an indifferent meal. Here is how Dr O'Flaherty writes:

> Hamann's thought concerning the symbolic nature of all knowledge is best summed up in his remark in *The Wise Men from the East at Bethlehem* (1760) to the effect that "human living seems to consist of a series of symbolic actions by means of which our soul is capable of revealing its *invisible* nature, and produces and communicates beyond itself an *intuitive* [i.e. empirical] knowledge of its effective existence". (H.'s italics.) This statement is explicit warranty of the fact, everywhere implied in his thought, that symbolization is the essence of mind. He recognizes that language is not the only symbolic medium available to man, but it is the most effective and important. This is true because God is a speaking God, and man, in so far as he preserves the divine image, seeks to know mediately or symbolically, and not immediately or a-symbolically.

From that passage it may be gathered that whether or not language for Hamann is experience, language for Dr O'Flaherty is apparently postal-sorting, pigeon-holing, thrusting lumps of cold meat into the deep freeze, bibliography (the bibliography at the end of his volume is excellent), or anything you like except the instrument of exposition. That is a pity, for the S.C.M. Press has in prospect a book of translated selections from Hamann's writings, and before it appears English readers should receive some preparation for what they will find in it.

PETERBOROUGH. MONTGOMERY BELGION.

SOHN GOTTES ALS CHRISTUSBEZEICHNUNG DER SYNOPTIKER. By Joachim Bieneck. Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich. Fr. 6.

This study won for the author the degree of Dr theol. in the University of Basle. In stating the task to be essayed, Dr Bieneck opposes Professor Bultmann's views on the growth and development of early Christianity and more especially his contention that the title Son of God is to be explained by similar terms current in the Hellenistic world. The O.T. background is first examined where the

term is applied both to the people of Israel called to obedience and to their king, who in special measure is the subject of God's love and owes obedience to him. The particular position of Ps. 2, with its affinities to Near Eastern ideologies of kingship, is recognized, as is also the scarcity and ambiguity of evidence in later Judaism. The Hellenistic "sons of God", on the other hand, are personages accounted divine, miracle workers, philosophers, and emperors. It is not sonship of God which is their distinguishing mark but outstanding character and position. The relevant Synoptic passages are then surveyed, including those in which God is described as the Father of Jesus.

The significance of the title is dealt with under two headings: the majesty of the Son and the obedience of the Son. It is clearly to be distinguished from other Messianic designations. Satan, demons, angels, and God himself know and use it in its full meaning. Jesus employs it as occasional self-designation. But, according to the author, it is not given to men to understand it. It is given specially to Peter (Matt. 16. 16 f.) to pronounce it with its full force, while in the other instances when men use it they either pervert its meaning or only partly comprehend it. The author's argument here fails, I think, to convince and the Synoptic passages are accommodated only with difficulty within his rigid scheme. The relevant Synoptic passages are shown to reveal the unique majesty as well as the complete obedience of the Son to his Father. From the Synoptic evidence the author concludes that the title cannot be explained by adducing Hellenistic parallels, while the O.T. title can be said to be relevant only in that in Jesus, the Son of God, the position of Israel as son of God finds its perfect fulfilment in majesty and obedience. In an Excursus the important saying Matt. 11. 25–30 (Luke 10. 21–22) is discussed and it is argued that Matt. 11. 25–30 is an integral whole and displays the double aspect of the title Son of God.

In spite of the value of the study, it may be asked whether the author has not been led into disregarding the Hellenistic background which, though not decisive, may have exercised some influence in the contemporary understanding of the title.

K. H. Kuhn.

Durham.

The Cause of Being: The Philosophy of Creation in St Thomas. By James F. Anderson. Herder. 25s.

Not very long ago Dr J. F. Anderson wrote an extremely interesting book on the doctrine of analogy with the title *The Bond of Being*. He has followed it up in the present work with a discussion of the doctrine of creation. Dr Anderson is a strict Thomist; his work is none the worse for that. But its value would have been greatly enhanced if he had made more effort to relate the technical terminology of scholasticism to more generally familiar language. And there are places where the author's obvious capacity for thinking in Latin seems to have impaired the intelligibility of his English writing. It

would be a pity if these incidental defects resulted in the book receiving less attention than it deserves.

The book opens with a chapter on the Cause of Being as Being, in which the fundamental existentialism of Thomist natural theology is made clear. This is followed by a chapter in which the peculiar analogical sense in which creation is defined as *making out of nothing* is expounded and defended against misunderstanding. These two chapters are not free from some repetitiveness and turgidity, but the book really gets into its stride in the next two chapters, in which a full discussion is given of two of the great questions of Thomist metaphysics. The first of these deals with the problem of whether a created world could, without contradiction, have an infinite duration *a parte ante*; the second with the problem of the metaphysical possibility of an actual infinity of finite beings. On the first of these Dr Anderson agrees with St Thomas that, so far as the natural reason can tell us, the world might have always existed, though, with St Thomas, he recognizes the weight of some of the contrary arguments. I find it difficult, however, to agree with his assertion that, if time *did* have a beginning, creation by God is thereby proved. Nor can I agree that if the aeviternity of the angels necessitated existence from eternity the entire doctrine of creation as a free act would collapse; for it would still be the case that God was free to create these aeviternal beings or not as he pleased.

The discussion of the actual infinite is attractive and illuminating, but it would have benefited greatly by some reference to the modern mathematical doctrine of the infinite. It is worth pointing out how many of the modern discoveries were anticipated by the medievals—and also how they were handicapped by not anticipating more. Dr Anderson comes emphatically to the conclusion that St Thomas believed an actual infinity of finite beings to be impossible.

The last two chapters deal with the creative ubiquity of God and with his final causality. On the whole the book is so good that one can only wish it were better.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

E. L. Mascall.

Die Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis im Lichte seiner Christologie. By G. W. Locher. Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich. Fr. 11.45.

The greater our ignorance, the more confident sometimes are our judgments. If this is true in general, it is particularly true in relation to the thought of Zwingli. Even in Switzerland Zwingli has been grossly misrepresented and misinterpreted, and in our own country he is famous chiefly for opinions which he never held, while the solid mass of his teaching is virtually unknown.

In these circumstances we have particular cause to be grateful to a Zwingli-student like G. W. Locher that he has initiated a fresh and more searching study of the theology of Zwingli, with the Christology as his guiding principle. He could hardly have chosen better, for, as he demonstrates convincingly in the introductory section, in spite of appearances to the contrary the teaching of Zwingli is from first to

last Christocentric. The volume before us is only the first part of a projected trilogy, and it is devoted to the doctrine of God, but already, on the basis of a close investigation of Zwingli's writings, the author has been able to correct many popular misconceptions.

Perhaps the main point which he makes is that there is no essential duality in Zwingli's doctrine of God as his expositions might sometimes suggest. Certainly, Zwingli uses the terminology of Greek and medieval philosophy, but he is not building a Biblical superstructure upon a philosophical foundation. Indeed, the very opposite is the case, for, as Locher points out, the philosophical terminology is itself given a strictly Biblical content. The point is important, for it means that the humanism of Zwingli was subservient always to his faith. He expounded his doctrine of God in philosophical terms, but he derived the doctrine from Biblical and not from philosophical sources. The God about whom he wrote was the living and self-revealing God of Scripture, not an abstraction of human thought.

A further point which Locher emphasizes is the careful orthodoxy of Zwingli in relation to the Incarnation and especially the Trinity. With regard to the latter, it has been remarked that Zwingli seldom refers to the Trinity. But Locher has no difficulty in proving that for Zwingli Trinitarian doctrine was regarded as basic and self-evident. After all, the theology of the Reformation was for the most part a theology of controversy, and the Trinity was not one of the controverted doctrines. It belonged to that deposit of the faith which was guarded by the reformer no less than the traditionalist.

It is unfortunate, perhaps, that in this volume we do not have any detailed discussion of Zwingli's teaching on the two natures, or of the bearing of this doctrine on such vital aspects of his theology as Providence, Church and Sacraments. Until these matters are dealt with in the two succeeding volumes, it is impossible to form any proper estimate of the work as a whole. But already the author has given us a careful and stimulating study, and one which is particularly relevant to contemporary theological development.

G. W. Bromiley.

Edinburgh.

SHORTER NOTICES

Studies in Muslim Ethics. By Dwight M. Donaldson. S.P.C.K. 27s. 6d.

The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazali. By W. Montgomery Watt. Allen and Unwin. 9s. 6d.

These two books are useful additions to Islamic studies: both are by experts. Dr Donaldson, who was formerly principal of the Henry Martyn School at Aligarh, has expanded his lectures on Muslim ethics given at universities and theological colleges in India and the United States. He points out that Islamic thinkers have long regarded this subject as one intimately connected not only with logic and metaphysics but also with the Qur'an, the Muslim bible. This explains why there is so much concentration on theological principles.

Dr Donaldson treats of his subject historically, and devotes much attention to Ibn Maskawaihi, the eleventh-century moral philosopher and theologian, whose book *The Correction of Dispositions and the Cleansing of Veins,* written when Muslim scholars were most receptive to Greek philosophy, is perhaps the basic Muslim ethical classic.

The less specialist reader will find of particular interest the first five chapters on the early development of Islamic moral philosophy and the last two dealing with nineteenth-century re-interpretation and a general appraisal. Dr Donaldson has also added an extensive bibliography and index. His book will be regarded for a long time as one of the important English handbooks on Islam.

The second book contains an English translation by Dr Montgomery Watt, of the University of Edinburgh, of *The Deliverance from Error* and *The Beginning of Guidance,* works of one of the greatest Muslim philosophers, the Persian mystic Al-Ghazali, who died in A.D. 1111. *The Deliverance from Error* is largely an autobiographical account of Al-Ghazali's own spiritual pilgrimage and includes his criticism of theologians, philosophers, authoritarians, and mystics. His mystical and ascetic teaching are epitomized in the other book here translated, *The Beginning of Guidance,* some of the directions of which will sound strange, even amusing, to the western reader. Dr Watt has enriched the new "Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West" series by making the work of this "greatest Muslim after Muhammed" available to the Arabic-less reader. Al-Ghazali not only led the triumph of Islamic orthodoxy over Neo-platonism, but also brought about a better understanding between the Sunni theologians and the Sufi mystics. "Christians, too, now that the world is in a cultural melting-pot, must be prepared to learn from Islam, and are unlikely to find a more sympathetic guide than Al-Ghazali"; and Dr Watt has admirably introduced this guide in his translation and its introduction.

D. W. GUNDRY.

LA MÈRE DES FIDÈLES. By F. M. Braun. Casterman (Tournai). 84 frs.

No doubt it never was true that "one half of Christendom worships a Jew, and the other a Jewess". But fear of appearing to worship St Mary tends to inhibit a proper veneration among non-Roman Christians. *La Mère des Fidèles* should help to overcome that inhibition. Its author presents a restrained exposition of three Johannine passages concerned with St Mary (John 2. 1–11 and 19. 25–28; Rev. 12). He sets out to confine himself within the limits of Johannine thought. But, he says, "I can only repeat my surprise at discovering there . . . already with a marvellous coherence, the traditional doctrine which the Church has never ceased to elaborate throughout the centuries" (pp. 184–5).

No doubt the non-Roman reader will sometimes be surprised too; especially at the discovery of Johannine warrant for the mediatorial role of Mary in the connexion of John 2. 4 ("mine hour is not yet come") with the scene at the foot of the Cross. At Cana Jesus gently

repudiates the authority of his mother, based on ties of nature: at Calvary she is reunited with him by the spiritual bond of shared suffering. Henceforth she assumes the role of intercessor, denied to her at Cana as a regular and natural privilege.

Père Braun's exposition of the third Word from the Cross is also open to criticism. It is treated almost exclusively as the committal of John, the model disciple, to the maternal care of Mary. But this hardly allows enough for the transformation of the maternal relationship brought about by the maturity of the child, which is some small part of the meaning of John 2. 1–11.

The author sees in John 19. 25–28 the fulfilment of the Protevangelium (Gen. 3. 15) and claims that John intended for Mary the role of Second Eve. In Rev. 12 he holds that the "woman clothed with the sun" means primarily Mary, as Prototype of the Church, though the "polyvalence" of Johannine phraseology makes an absolute choice unnecessary. But is it not contrary to the symbolism of the Apocalypse to represent a woman by a woman?

GRAHAM NEVILLE.

SUTTON-IN-ASHFIELD.

CRITICISM AND FAITH. By John Knox. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. $1.75. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

Those who still ask of the Biblical narrative "Is it true?" instead of "What does it mean?" should read this book, in which Dr Knox sets the Bible in its true relation to the event and its interpretation by the community. Long ago William Temple taught us that "the essence of revelation is intercourse of mind and event" and "the locus of revelation is not the mind but the event". Dr Knox shows that Biblical criticism, in laying bare the event in its original character and context, has enriched the life of the Church. Again the historian, by placing documents in chronological order, can trace the gradual realization of the meaning of events by the Church, and thus the gradual unfolding of the event itself, for "the event had not fully occurred until the initial process of realization was complete". The Bible has authority because of its proximity to the event, but "we must *interpret* the account to recover the event". The Church, the community of the Spirit, interprets events in its continuing life, and it is historical criticism which prevents the Church absorbing the event completely and losing sight of the autonomy of the event and its precedence to the Church. By many cogent arguments Dr Knox portrays convincingly "the role of Biblical scholarship in the life of the Church" and shows that criticism has underpinned rather than undermined the foundations of the faith. Although concerned in the main with the New Testament, the arguments concern the problems of the Bible as a whole. The chapter on creative interpretation is of special interest, and concludes with a reminder that the historical critic must be creative as well as critical, for he must not only "get down" to the facts of his subject; he must also "reach up to its meaning".

The final chapter on historical criticism and preaching should be of value to students and others who take seriously the Ministry of the Word. Theological colleges should find a place for this book in their libraries.

LONDON. MARIANNE TURNER.

DIE GESCHICHTE DER MARIENVEREHRUNG IM DEUTSCHEN PROTESTANTISMUS. By Reintraud Schimmelpfennig. Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn. Boards: D.M. 4.80; cloth: D.M. 6.80.

Dr Schimmelpfennig examines the way in which the highly developed Mary cult of the Middle Ages has been changed and modified in Protestant Germany since the Reformation. Her sources are not only the writings of the representative theologians but also confessional writings, church orders, and hymns, together with evidence drawn from German literature. The book is well documented and of great interest. The hope expressed by the author in the preface that the book will be a contribution to the ecumenical discussions of the present day will not, however, be shared by those who believe that Mariology occupies a place only on the periphery of theological thinking.

DURHAM. K. H. KUHN.

FOOLISHNESS TO THE GREEKS. By T. R. Milford. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

SEEING AND BELIEVING. By G. L. Phillips. Dacre Press. 6s. and 4s.

ESSAI SUR LE MYSTÈRE DE L'HISTOIRE. By Jean Daniélou. Editions du Seuil, Paris. N.p.

I happened to read these three books together, and they all deal with fundamentals. *Foolishness to the Greeks* is based chiefly on addresses given during a mission to the University of Toronto. "It tries to interpret life and the world from a position inside the historical body whose centre is Christ." Many besides university students will find that it speaks to their condition. The author has a cool but piercing way of putting things. Other teachers and preachers will do well to study his methods, and in doing so will find that the supposedly familiar again and again comes freshly home to themselves.

Seeing and Believing was published as a "Lent book", but there is nothing to restrict it to, nor to make it particularly suitable for, that season. To whom is it addressed? There is an explicit indication that it is intended for "the non-specialist reader", for whom *An Augustine Synthesis* is "generally available". In fact, it falls between two stools; it is too sophisticated and allusive for most readers of that class (which we should not have supposed to be a very extensive one), and too scrappy and imprecise for the more learned. The author confesses that it was "hastily written". He obviously has something burning in his mind about the nature of faith, and occasional flashes of light break out. One may wish that in future he will have time for the

disciplined reading, thinking, and writing which will enable him to give his message worthy expression.

Essai sur le Mystère de l'Histoire is the most substantial of these books. It comprises a whole series of essays on various aspects of the Christian understanding of time and of the duty of engagement in present history. Biblical, patristic, and existential themes are interwoven. Père Daniélou converses freely and appreciatively with protestant scholars, notably with Oscar Cullmann, and, what is unusual in French or German theologians, he is remarkably well acquainted with recent British work on his subject—e.g., with that of Professor Butterfield (though he does christen him "Hubert") and of Professor Dodd (though he does receive him into the Church of England). This is a book for theologians. It is full of wisdom and insight and right on the nerve of contemporary debates.

A. R. V.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY. By R. S. Franks. Duckworth's Theology Series. 8s. 6d.

Dr Franks has given us a very competent and scholarly historical discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity which will repay careful study. Used with care it may be a useful handbook for theological colleges.

In the first part of the book he deals with the beginnings of the doctrine in Palestinian Christianity, in relation to the background of the Hellenistic world, in the Pauline Epistles, the Synoptic Gospels, 1 Peter and Hebrews, and the Johannine writings. In this part he deals very briefly with some of the points raised by Professor Knight in *A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity*. The second part of the book is an account of the development of the doctrine from Irenaeus to Augustine. The third part takes us from Aquinas to Barth and Hodgson.

It is extremely good value in 201 pages for 8s. 6d.

It is not meant as an adverse criticism of Dr Franks to say that in reading books dealing with these profound and vital matters one realizes the point of declarations in the introductions of the older authors that all that they say is submitted to the judgment of the Spirit-guided Church, the pillar and ground of the truth.

EYNSFORD. D. G. HILL.

GUIDE FOR RESEARCH-TICKET HOLDERS. Published by Standing Conference of Theological and Philosophical Libraries in London. 1s. 3d., post free.

This guide-book contains particulars of a useful scheme which will enable students or research-workers in philosophy and theology to visit over twenty libraries in London with a single ticket. Inquiries, and orders for the guide-book, should be addressed to Miss Joan Ferrier, Hon. Sec. S.C.O.T.A.P.L.L., C.M.S. Library, 6, Salisbury Square, London, E.C.4.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS: Harris Franklin Rall, *Religion as Salvation* ($3.00).

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS (THOMAS NELSON AND SONS): *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. I (£3 7s. 6d.).

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Israel I. Mattuck, *The Thought of the Prophets* (9s. 6d.); G. E. Moore, *Some Main Problems of Philosophy* (25s.); Howard Brinton, *Friends for 300 Years* (15s.).

ASSOCIATION FOR PROMOTING RETREATS: *General List of Retreats* (1s.).

ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK: R. C. Mortimer, *Western Canon Law* (7s. 6d. and 5s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Henry Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* (60s.).

CHRISTOPHER PUBLISHING HOUSE (BOSTON, MASS.): W. K. Prentice, *The Gospel of the Kingdom of God* ($3.50).

CORK UNIVERSITY PRESS: Yvonne Servais, *Charles Péguy, The Pursuit of Salvation* (25s.).

ÉGLISE VIVANTE (PARIS): André V. Seumois, *La Papauté et les Missions au cours des six premiers siècles* (500 frs.).

EPWORTH PRESS: A. Raymond George, *Communion with God in the New Testament* (25s.).

GOLLANCZ: Karl Jaspers, *Tragedy is not Enough* (8s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Thomas B. Costain, *The Silver Chalice* (15s.).

LONGMANS: Joseph P. Smith, S.J. (Trans.), *Ancient Christian Writers*, Vol. XVI. *St Irenaeus: Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* (25s.); Ludwig Bieler (Trans.), *Ancient Christian Writers*, Vol. XVII. *The Works of St Patrick, St Secundinus, Hymn on St Patrick*. Appendix: The *Lorica* (25s.).

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS: R. S. Cripps, *Two British Interpreters of the Old Testament: Robert Lowth and Samuel Lee* (2s.).

MOWBRAY: *St Athanasius on the Incarnation:* the Treatise *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*, translated and edited by A Religious of C.S.M.V., with an Introduction by C. S. Lewis [First edition was reviewed in THEOLOGY, July 1944, pp. 161 f.] (7s. 6d.).

THOMAS NELSON AND SONS: *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (£4 4s.).

PRESENT QUESTION CONFERENCE: *Conflicts of Loyalties?* (7s.).

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: Paul S. Minear and Paul S. Morimoto, *Kierkegaard and the Bible, An Index* (n.p.).

ST MARTIN-IN-THE-FIELDS: G. Kitson Clark, *Elizabeth by the Grace of God* [William Ainslie Memorial Lecture] (1s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Daniel Day Williams, *Intepreting Theology 1918-1952* (10s. 6d.); Oscar Cullmann, *Peter: Disciple-Apostle-Martyr* (18s.).

SKEFFINGTON: Donald A. Foster, *An Anglican Year* (5s.).

S.P.C.K.: *A Child's Guide to Evening Prayer* (1s.); Catharine R. Newby, *The Junior Sunday School (Children of 7-11)* (3s. 9d.); Ulrich E. Simon, *A Theology of Salvation* (25s.); Lesbia Scott, *Wherefore This Waste?* [A missionary play] (3s.); R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon* (37s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: F. N. Davey, *The Good Shepherd and His Flock* (5s.); G. W. Loughborough and E. M. Lamb, *The Church and the Prayer Book* (3s.).

WORLD DOMINION PRESS: Alexander McLeish, *Objective Method and Christian Expansion* (1s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher